

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Robert L. Johnson,)	C/A No. 4:07-1625-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Report and Recommendation
vs.)	
)	
Nubian Princess E,N,T.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

This is a civil action filed *pro se* by an Alabama state prison inmate.¹ Plaintiff is a state prisoner in Alabama. He is suing a mail order business located in Timmonsville, South Carolina because he claims in his Complaint's statement of claim section to have sent them two (2) books of stamps (2 x \$7.40 = \$ 14.80) in payment for several pictures to be mailed to him, but which never arrived.² He also claims to have asked for his name and address to be placed on the internet to get pen pals. No value is placed on this requested service. He asks this Court to require Defendant to either send him back his stamps or provide the goods and services for which he contracted.

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff's *pro se* Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), D.S.C., this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such *pro se* cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court. *See also* 28 U.S.C. § § 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

² In the affidavit submitted along with his Complaint, Plaintiff states that he sent "4" books and in the "issues" section of the Complaint, he states that he sent "3" books. For purposes of this Report, the number given in the statement of claim section, "2," is being used. In any event, whether he sent 2, 3, or 4 books, the diversity jurisdictional amount in controversy still would not be present in this case.

procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § § 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, __ U.S. __, __ S. Ct. __, __ L.Ed.2d __, 2007 WL 1582936 (2007); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n.7 (1980); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of N. Y.*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2d Cir. 1975). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387(4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to summary dismissal under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) because this Court is without jurisdiction to consider Plaintiff's claims.

Analysis

In order for this Court to hear and decide a case, the Court must, first, have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the litigation. It is well settled that federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and statute, *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U.S. 131, 136-37 (1992); *Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 541

(1986), which is not to be expanded by judicial decree, *American Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, 341 U.S. 6 (1951). It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, *Turner v. Bank of N. Am.*, 4 U.S. (4 Dall.) 8, 11 (1799), and the burden of establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction, *McNutt v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 182-83 (1936). The two most commonly recognized and utilized bases for federal court jurisdiction are (1) “federal question,” 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and (2) “diversity of citizenship.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The allegations contained in the Complaint filed by Plaintiff in this case do not fall within the scope of either form of this Court’s limited jurisdiction, and there is no other possible basis for federal jurisdiction evident.

First, there is no basis for a finding of diversity jurisdiction over this Complaint. The diversity statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), requires complete diversity of parties and an amount in controversy in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00):

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

(1) citizens of different States[.]

28 U.S.C. § 1332 (emphasis added). Complete diversity of parties in a case means that no party on one side may be a citizen of the same state as any party on the other side. *Owen Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 372-74 (1978). Although the Complaint and the parties listed therein appear to meet the complete diversity requirement since Plaintiff appears to be a resident of Alabama while Defendant appears to be a business concern located in South Carolina,³ this Court has no

³ Even though Defendant appears to be business or corporate entity and not a human being, it is still a “resident” of South Carolina as that term is legal understood. *See Huggins v. Winn-Dixie* (continued...)

diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332 over this case because the allegations do not support a finding that the \$75,000 jurisdictional amount is in controversy in this case. The total value of the stamps sent by Plaintiff was only \$ 17.80 and no value is given for the internet pen-pal service. Plaintiff does not seek any form of damages or relief other than rescission of the contract and return of the stamps or specific performance by Defendant, *i.e.*, provision of the goods and services ordered. As a result, the jurisdictional amount in controversy is not shown to be involved, and, accordingly, there is no basis for the Court to exercise its diversity jurisdiction in this case.

Second, it is clear that the essential allegations contained in the Complaint are insufficient to show that the case is one “arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331. That is, the Complaint does not state a claim cognizable under this Court’s “federal question” jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s Complaint involves a routine breach of contract dispute. Generally, such contract disputes are a matter of state law to be heard in the state courts, unless diversity of citizenship is present. *See Mail Mart, Inc. v. Action Mktg. Consultants, Inc.*, 281 S.C. 167, 314 S.E.2d 351 (1984); *Rowland v. Pruitt*, 123 S.C. 244, 116 S.E. 456 (1923).

Furthermore, Plaintiff’s allegations do not contain any reference to alleged violation of any federal statute or constitutional provision by Defendant, nor is any type of federal question jurisdiction otherwise evident from the face of the Complaint. Even if Plaintiff had made assertions that federal rights were violated, this Court would not be bound by such allegations and would be entitled to disregard them if the facts did not support Plaintiff’s contentions. When considering the issue of whether a case is one “arising under the Constitution . . .” or, in other words, whether

³(...continued)
Greenville, Inc., 233 F.Supp. 667 , 669 (D. S.C. 1964).

“federal question” jurisdiction is present, a federal court is not bound by the parties' characterization of a case. District courts are authorized to disregard such characterizations to avoid "unjust manipulation or avoidance of its jurisdiction." *Lyon v. Centimark Corp.*, 805 F. Supp. 333, 334-35 (E.D. N.C. 1992); see *Louisville & Nashville R.R. v. Mottley*, 211 U.S. 149 (1908); *cf. Gully v. First Nat'l Bank in Meridian*, 299 U.S. 109 (1936) (“Not every question of federal law emerging in a suit is proof that a federal law is the basis of the suit.”); *Bonner v. Circuit Ct. of St. Louis*, 526 F.2d 1331, 1336 (8th Cir. 1975) (federal constitutional claims are cognizable in both state courts and in federal courts: “Congress and the federal courts have consistently recognized that federal courts should permit state courts to try state cases, and that, where constitutional issues arise, state court judges are fully competent to handle them subject to Supreme Court review.”).

Additionally, purely private conduct such as that alleged in this case, no matter how wrongful, injurious, fraudulent, or discriminatory, is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or under the Fourteenth Amendment, the two most common provisions under which persons come into federal court to claim that others have violated their constitutional rights. See *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 936 (1982); *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Auth.*, 365 U.S. 715, 721 (1961). As stated above, Plaintiff does not cite to either 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or the Fourteenth Amendment in his Complaint, nor does claim that the Defendant, a private business, violated his constitutional rights. Even if he had included such allegations, however, they would not establish “federal question” jurisdiction over this case because there are no additional allegations of “state action” in connection with the breach of contract of which Plaintiff complains.

In order to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) the defendant(s) deprived him or her of a federal right, and (2) did so under color of state law. *Gomez*

v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980); see *Hall v. Quillen*, 631 F.2d 1154, 1155-56 & nn. 2-3 (4th Cir. 1980). Because the United States Constitution regulates only the Government, not private parties, a litigant claiming that his constitutional rights have been violated must first establish that the challenged conduct constitutes "state action." See, e.g., *Blum v. Yaretsky*, 457 U.S. 991, 1002 (1982). To qualify as state action, the conduct in question "must be caused by the exercise of some right or privilege created by the State or by a rule of conduct imposed by the State or by a person for whom the State is responsible," and "the party charged with the [conduct] must be a person who may fairly be said to be a state actor." *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. at 937; see *U. S. v. Int'l Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen Helpers of Am., AFL-CIO*, 941 F.2d 1292 (2d Cir.1991). As noted, there are no allegations in Plaintiff's Complaint which attribute any of Defendants' actions to state action; therefore, even if the Complaint could be liberally construed to "imply" an allegation of constitutional rights violations by the Defendant, such implied interpretation would not establish "federal question" jurisdiction in this case. In the absence of either diversity or federal question jurisdiction over the parties' dispute, this case should be summarily dismissed without issuance of process for Defendant.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez; Neitzke v. Williams; Haines v. Kerner; Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 & n. * (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh; Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d at 74; see also 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine

whether they are subject to summary dismissal). Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

June 15, 2007
Florence, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P.O. Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *U. S. v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).